DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 386 CS 502 322

AUTHOR Carrocci, Noreen M.
TITLE An Exploratory Study of Interpersonal Trust between the Sexes.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (64th, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 2-5, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Communication (Thought Transfer); Credibility; Intercommunication; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes; Social Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research; Giffin Trust Scale; *Interpersonal Trust

ABSTRACT

To determine the extent to which males and females bring similar or dissimilar attitudes of trust to encounters with members of the same or the opposite sex, a study was conducted that examined attitudes of interpersonal trust according to the subject's perception of the expertness (validity of judgment), reliability, and dynamism of the attitude object. For the study, 102 males and 135 females were tested on a 27-item semantic differential instrument and the results were analyzed according to the variables of sex of subject, sex of attitude object, and relationship to attitude object (closest friend or that sex in general). The study revealed the following: females perceived people of both sexes to be more expert and hold stronger attitudes of interpersonal trust than did males; neither males nor females were perceived to be more or less expert overall by both sexes, but men considered males to be more expert than females; both sexes perceived females as higher on the character dimension of the test and males were perceived as more dynamic; and closest friends of both sexes were rated higher on all three dimensions than were both sexes in general. (MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED162386

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL TRUST BETWEEN THE SEXES

Noreen M. Carrocci
University of Kansas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Noreen M. Carrocci

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A paper presented at the Speech Communication Association 64th Annual meeting, November 2-5, 1978, for the Debut Program of the Interpersonal and Small Group Interaction Division.

CS502322

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL TRUST BETWEEN THE SEXES

The Feminist Movement of the 1960s seems to have been the impetus for much research concerning the differences between females and males, sex-roles, and sex role stereotypes. In over 600 pages Maccoby and Jacklin provide an excellent summary of the myriad scholarly studies conducted just since 1966. Differences between the sexes in terms of intellect and achievement, socialization, sex-typing, and social behavior are but a few of the topics covered.[1] Chafetz' Masculine/Feminine or Human? is devoted entirely to the exploration of sex roles in our society.[2] Baird has recently provided a comprehensive summary and review of research relating to sex differences in small group communication.[3]

Coincidentally, another body of literature has emerged which applies human relations principles to the female-male relationship. Examples of such works are: O'Neill and O'Neill's Open Marriage,[4] Masters and Johnson's The Pleasure Bond,[5] and Patton and Ritter's Living Together.[6] One variable that has been recognized by these authors as being of central importance in the female-male relationship is trust. O'Neill and O'Neill, for example, devote an entire chapter to this communication variable.[7]

Aside from the specific context of the female-male relationship, trust is also consistently recognized by communication scholars as a pivotal variable in all contexts of human communication. As Johnson states, "Little happens in a relationship until the individuals learn to trust each other."[8] After more than twenty years of studying T-groups and problem-solving (i.e., task) groups, Jack Gibb has concluded that trust is the pacemaker variable in group growth. Trust among members is necessary for a small group to develop an adequate feedback and data-processing system, to establish and integrate goals, and to develop a feeling of interdependence or mutual influence among group members.[9] The most important element in Rogers' client-centered therapy is an atmosphere of psychological safety. That is, the client feels safe and thus trusts the therapist as a listener when she/he behaves in a manner that displays genuineness, nonpossessive warmth and accurate empathy.[10] Giffin has concluded "that the central construct for good interpersonal relations is trust."[11]

Trust seems to be a prerequisite to sharing parts of ourselves or self-disclosing which, in turn, is necessary for establishing and maintaining human relationships. Likewise, trust is necessary for the self-disclosure which is essential in establishing and maintaining the female-male relationship. Yet little empirical evidence exists concerning the operation of trust as a communication variable between the sexes.

This study was conducted in an effort to determine to what extent, if any, females and males bring similar or dissimilar attitudes of trust to encounters with members of the same or opposite sex. Once it is known to what extent such differences exist efforts can be made to determine how

these attitudes affect communication behaviors between the sexes. Specifically, this study explored the following questions:

1. What are females' attitudes of interpersonal trust toward: a) females in general, b) males in general, c) their closest female friend, and d) their closest male friend?

2. What are males' attitudes of interpersonal trust toward: a) females in general, b) males in general, c) their closest female friend, and d) their closest male friend?

"Informal" hypotheses purporting to answer these questions abound. In discussions of interpersonal trust between females and males, students are very quick to state their positions: "Guys aren't trustworthy, but my boyfriend is!"; "I trust my girlfriend, but not all women in general." Of course, these are just individually stated opinions. No evidence could be found to support or refute these assumptions, and no previous study has explored the attitudes of interpersonal trust females and males have toward the same and opposite sex.

Prior research findings provide some indirect evidence that differences in attitudes of interpersonal trust do exist between the sexes, and that differences exist depending upon the degree of intimacy in the relationship. For example, Sidney Jourard posits that self-disclosure follows an attitude of love and trust, and the most consistent difference he found in a series of questionnaire studies of self-disclosure was that women disclosed more about themselves than did men.[12] This finding indicates that perhaps females have stronger attitudes of interpersonal trust than males. Another finding of Jourard's was a significant correlation between how well the subjects (both females and males) knew the target person, and the amount and type of information that was disclosed to him/her.[13] Also, Lockwood and Eman, using a modified version of Jourard's self-disclosure instrument, found that one of the predictor variables that led to a discrimination between friends and acquaintances was "willingness to discuss intimate topics."[14] Thus, it was speculated that some differences in attitudes of interpersonal trust might exist for people depending upon whether they considered a closest female or male friend, or either sex in general.

Giffin, Heider, Groginsky, and Drake found attitudes of interpersonal trust, as measured by the Giffin Trust Differential (see below), to be positively correlated with self-concept, as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.[15] These findings led Giffin to later hypothesize that a person's trust of another is a function of her/his own self-concept.[16] In terms of self-concept alone, it seems that females' and males' self-concepts would differ due to differing socialization processes. This is not to say that their self-concepts differ in terms of "high" or "low." As a matter of fact, after reviewing several studies dealing with self-esteem and/or self-concept, Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that there are no differences between the sexes; females and males have equally positive or negative overall self-concepts.[17] There do seem to be differences, however, in the components of the sexes' self-concepts as perceived by men and women of all ages. For example, Broverman, et al. conducted a series of studies over a six-year period developing and administering a sex-role questionnaire. Attributes such as independence, objectivity, competitiveness, and self-confidence comprised a "competency" cluster, which both females and males

perceived as being male-valued. A "warmth and expressiveness" cluster, including the attributes of gentleness, tactfulness, and ability to express tender feelings, were perceived by both sexes as being female-valued items.[18] Thus, different characteristics seem to comprise both sexes' views of male self-concepts and female self-concepts. Given the above findings and Giffin's hypothesis, it was suspected that differences in attitudes of interpersonal trust might exist depending upon a subject's sex, and the sex of a person or group a subject considered.

In order to explore the relationship between attitudes of interpersonal trust and the sexes it was necessary first to identify a conceptual framework from which to study the construct of interpersonal trust and also a method for measuring it.[19] After reviewing three such conceptualizations, Kim Giffin's was chosen as that most amenable to exploring attitudes of interpersonal trust between the sexes. Giffin defines interpersonal trust as "reliance upon the communication behavior of another person in order to achieve a desired but uncertain objective in a risky situation."[20] In an effort to measure an attitude of interpersonal trust (as per his definition) Giffin constructed the Giffin Trust Differential (see description below).[21] An attitude of interpersonal trust is influenced by perceptions of another's:

1. Expertness - this may be in terms of quantity of relevant information, degree of ability or skill, or validity of judgment.
2. Reliability - Character - a characteristic perceived as dependability, predictability, or favorable intent of the trusted person.
3. Dynamism - behavior perceived as more active than passive, and more open or frank than closed or deceptive.[22]

With the above serving as the conceptual framework, the following main hypotheses were tested in an effort to explore the above questions:[23]

I. There will be differences between females' and males' expressed attitudes of interpersonal trust (on the expertness, character, and dynamism dimensions) toward members of the same and opposite sex.
II. There will be differences between expressed attitudes of interpersonal trust (on the expertness, character, and dynamism dimensions) toward "females" versus "males."
III. There will be differences between expressed attitudes of interpersonal trust (on the expertness, character, and dynamism dimensions) toward a "closest friend" of both sexes versus both sexes "in general."

Method

Subjects

The source of data for the study was University of Kansas students enrolled in the Basic Communication Program, Fall Semester, 1976. A total of 102 males and 135 females participated in the study. Subjects were primarily first and second semester students. The mean age of subjects was 18.9 years.

Measuring Instrument

The Giffin Trust Differential-Form E (henceforth, GTD) served as the measuring instrument for the study. The GTD measures an attitude of interpersonal trust toward a specific person or group. As its name implies, the GTD is a 27-item semantic differential instrument, comprised of seven-point bipolar rating scales. Nine items each constitute the expertness, character, and dynamism dimensions, all of which have been found to be components of an attitude of interpersonal trust.[24]

Design and Procedures

The hypotheses to be tested called for a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial design (see Table I, Appendix). The first variable was sex of subject (female or male). The second variable was sex of attitude object (female or male). The third variable was relationship to attitude object (closest friend or that sex in general). All female subjects were randomly assigned to one of four female groups, and all male subjects were randomly assigned to one of four male groups. The subjects in each group were instructed to fill out one GTD while considering one of the following four attitude objects: your closest male friend; your closest female friend; males in general; or females in general.

Statistical Treatment

Each GTD was hand-scored for the factors of expertness, character, and dynamism. The design called for a three-way analysis of variance, which was performed for each of the three factors. The independent variables for all three ANOVAs were: sex of subject; sex of attitude object; and relationship to attitude object. The dependent variables were subjects' expertness, character, or dynamism scores. The ANOVAs provided the tests for the three main hypotheses. T-tests to compare the means provided tests for the various sub-hypotheses.

Results

Table 2 (see Appendix) presents the results of the ANOVA utilized for testing the three main hypotheses for the expertness dimension. The ANOVA revealed that sex of subject was a significant factor, and, therefore, hypothesis I was accepted. The overall mean score for female subjects (48.21) was greater than the overall mean score for the male subjects (46.10), implying that females consider people of both sexes to be more expert than do males. More specifically, t-tests revealed that female subjects considered females in general (henceforth, FIG) to be more expert than did male subjects ($t = 4.16$, $p < 0.005$). Likewise, females rated their "closest female friend" (henceforth, CFF) higher in expertness than did males, although the difference was not highly significant ($t = 1.76$, $p < .10$).

The result of the test for difference in perceptions of expertness due to sex of attitude object was not significant, and, therefore, hypothesis II was not accepted. However, the significant interaction between sex of subject and sex of attitude object indicates that sex of attitude object did have some

effect on subjects' perceptions of expertness. A test of the simple effects of sex of subject for "male" and "female" attitude objects (closest friend and general combined) revealed that male subjects perceived "males" to be significantly more expert than "females" and that female subjects considered "females" to be significantly more expert than "males." There is an exception to this latter finding, however, which accounts for the significant three-way interaction (SEX X SEXAO X RELAO). Female subjects perceived "females" (closest friend and in general) to be more expert than "males" (closest friend and in general) and FIG to be more expert than "males in general" (henceforth, MIG). However, they perceived a CFF to be slightly less expert than a "closest male friend" (henceforth, CMF).

There as a significant difference between both male and female subjects' perceptions of expertness for a "closest friend" of both sexes versus both sexes "in general" and, therefore, hypothesis III was accepted. Specifically, "closest friends" of both sexes were perceived to be more expert ($\bar{X}$ = 49.86) than both sexes "in general" ($\bar{X}$ = 44.95) by female and male subjects.

Subjects' scores from the character dimension of the GTD served as the data for the second ANOVA. The results of this ANOVA, which provided the test of the three main hypotheses, are presented in Table 3 (see Appendix). The test of the first main hypothesis received no difference in scores due to sex of subjects. Overall, females' and males' perceptions of character toward all four attitude objects did not differ significantly ($\bar{X}$ = 48.96, females; $\bar{X}$ = 47.22, males) and so hypothesis I was not accepted. Subsequent comparisons between means revealed one significant difference: female subjects perceived CMF to be higher in character than did male subjects ($t = 2.06$, $p < 0.025$).

Sex of the attitude objects was a significant factor for both females' and males' considerations of character. The overall mean score for both female and male subjects was higher for "female" attitude objects ("closest" and "general," $\bar{X}$ = 50.05) than for "male attitude objects ("closest" and "general," $\bar{X}$ = 46.12). This significant difference led to the acceptance of hypothesis II.

Hypothesis III, which addressed subjects' perceptions of character toward a "closest friend" of both sexes versus both sexes "in general," was accepted. Females and males consider their "closest friends" of both sexes to be much higher in character ($\bar{X}$ = 52.40) than both sexes "in general" ($\bar{X}$ = 43.775).

The three main hypotheses were tested a third time for subjects' scores from the dynamism dimension of the GTD. The results of this ANOVA are presented in Table 4 (see Appendix). The first main hypothesis was accepted since sex of subject proved to be a significant factor. This significant difference between female and male subjects' perceptions of dynamism toward members of the same and opposite sex is reflected in the overall mean scores. Female subjects' mean score (45.61) was higher than male subjects' mean score (43.61). The conclusion is that, overall, females perceive people to be more dynamic than do males.

Hypothesis II was accepted due to the significant difference found for female and male subjects' perceptions of dynamism toward female attitude objects ("closest" and "general") versus male attitude objects ("closest" and "general"). The overall mean score for those females and males who considered male attitude objects was higher ($\bar{X}$ = 46.83) than the overall mean score for those who considered female attitude objects ($\bar{X}$ = 42.39). Thus, both females and males perceived "males" to be more dynamic than "females."

The test of the third main hypothesis revealed a significant difference due to relationship to attitude object. Combining female and male subjects' scores for dynamism, the mean score for a "closest friend" of both sexes was higher ($\bar{X}$ = 46.80) than the mean score for both sexes "in general" ($\bar{X}$ = 42.42). Thus, hypothesis III was accepted and it was concluded that both females and males perceived their "closest friends" to be more dynamic than both sexes "in general." There was an exception, however, as reflected in the individual group means. The mean for male subjects rating a CMF was actually somewhat lower ($\bar{X}$ = 46.32) than for those male subjects rating MIG ($\bar{X}$ = 46.40). This difference was not significant, however, and the conclusion drawn was that these male subjects perceived a CMF to be no more or less dynamic than MIG.

There was a significant interaction between sex of attitude object and relationship to attitude object that further explains the above findings. The combined means, disregarding sex of subject, are presented in Table 5 (see Appendix). It can be seen from this table that FIG were perceived to be the least dynamic of all four groups. The test for simple effects revealed that the differentiation between CMF and MIG wasn't nearly as great as that between CFF and FIG. The finding that FIG were considered to be the least dynamic also further explains the significant difference found in the test of hypothesis II, where "females" were perceived to be less dynamic than "males."

Discussion

This study yielded several interesting findings. Beginning with subjects' perceptions of expertness for the various attitude objects, we found that females perceive people of both sexes to be more expert than do males. This result, together with female subjects' overall significantly higher ratings of others' dynamism, and their somewhat higher (albeit non-significant) overall ratings for the character dimension, imply that females hold stronger attitudes of interpersonal trust (or are more trusting of others) than do males. The work of Wrightsman provides indirect corroboration for this conclusion. Although his theoretical perspective encompasses the more generalized notion of trustworthiness of others, he has consistently found females to be more trusting than males.[25]

Based on the series of studies conducted by Broverman, et al., and socialization processes in our culture, one might have expected males to be considered more expert than females. In this study, however, neither males nor females were perceived to be more or less expert overall by both sexes. Apparently, a stereotyped image of males being the experts does not exist for this group of university students. The significant interaction between sex of subject and sex of attitude object provided another interesting finding. It was revealed that men consider males to be more expert than females, and women consider females to be more expert than males. These findings suggest the possibility that some changes in our society have taken place since, historically, males have been considered to be more knowledgeable, logical, scholarly, experienced, etc., especially by females. The results of this study suggest that presently females would rather turn to other females instead of males for help in matters requiring some expertise (and vice versa for males). It appears that females are gaining more confidence in their own sex; this newly found female credibility may be a direct result of the Feminist

Movement. For the female-male relationship the implication is that the female no longer depends upon the male to be more educated and knowledgeable than she. This may be a reflection of a change in the old stereotypic male "bread-winner" role.

The most interesting finding from subjects' scores on the character dimension of the GTD was that females were rated higher than males by both sexes. The adjectives from this dimension include "kind," "sincere," "moral," "nice," "patient," and "honest"; both sexes perceive females to be the chief possessors of these qualities. This implies that some sex-role stereotypes are still operant in communication between the sexes, especially from the males' point of view. Females found their closest male friends' character to be almost as high as their closest female friends', but this was not the case for males, who apparently considered their closest male friend to be much less sincere, honest, etc., than their closest female friend.

In relation to these findings it seems appropriate to point out that the items comprising the character dimension of the GTD are affect-oriented characteristics that usually surface when operating on the level of feelings. Females in our society are allowed and encouraged to express their feelings much more than are males. Males may be as sincere, honest, moral, etc., as females, but because they display their emotions less frequently than females (especially toward other males), others do not get the opportunity to see these qualities.

From subjects' scores on the dynamism dimension of the GTD it was found that, overall, males were perceived to be more dynamic than females. The interaction between sex of attitude object and relationship to attitude object revealed that the difference in subjects' perceptions of dynamism for a closest male friend compared to males in general was minimal, whereas the differentiation between closest female friend and females in general was very great. Females in general were perceived as much less dynamic than any of the other three groups. The stereotypic image of males being active, aggressive, bold, extroverted, etc., (all components of the dynamism dimension) and females being passive, unaggressive, timid, introverted, etc., still exists for these female and male students. These findings corroborate those of Chafetz' informal research and the series of studies conducted by Broverman, et al. The stereotype of the passive, unaggressive female does not pervade people's perceptions of a closest female friend, however, since both sexes perceived a closest female friend to be almost as dynamic as males. The implication is that in an intimate female-male relationship, the female does not necessarily play a passive, timid role.

One finding that consistently emerged for all three dimensions was that closest friends of both sexes were rated higher than both sexes in general. Both men and women perceived their closest friends to be more expert, more dynamic, and higher in character than males or females in general (with the exception noted above for males considering closest male friend vs. males in general). As Jourard, and Lockwood and Eman have discovered, close friends are more apt to discuss intimate topics and this type of self-disclosure follows an attitude of trust between the individuals. Thus, it seems logical that subjects would express a greater amount of trust toward a specific, close friend than they would toward a group of males or females in general.

The results of this study imply that perhaps some progress has been made in terms of reducing the number and pervasiveness of sex-role stereotypes. At the same time, it is clear that females and males either differed in their perceptions of the dimensions of trust for the sexes or both sexes perceived differences between the sexes. We can conclude, therefore, that there are some specific differences in attitudes of interpersonal trust between the sexes.

If the goal of communication research is to understand and explain the variables in the communication process and, on that basis, to improve human communication, it is necessary to study demonstrated differences between the sexes in attitudes of interpersonal trust. Our task now is to discern how these attitudinal differences influence behavior in specific same-sex and/or opposite-sex communication situations.[26] For example, attitudes of interpersonal trust could be determined by administering the Giffin Trust Differential in a manner identical or similar to the procedures employed in this study. At a later time subjects would be matched with a member of the same or opposite sex. Specific, risky situations that would require some type of trusting behavior would be presented to each pair and observations made of the communication strategies employed. Subjects' communication behaviors in these situations would then be compared to their GTD scores to see if expressed attitudes of interpersonal trust match communication strategies. Finally, in light of the information obtained from this investigation, further studies comparing the operation of other communication variables in same-sex versus opposite-sex communication situations seem clearly warranted.

It should be noted that the subjects for this study were a very homogeneous group. All subjects were University of Kansas students, most of whom were freshmen between 18 and 20 years of age. Therefore, we cannot be sure that the results obtained here would be the same for these subjects as they become upper-classmen, non-students of the same age, older women or men, or women and men from a different geographic location. Also, there is the possibility that one, five, or ten years hence, attitudes of interpersonal trust between the sexes may change as the mores and norms in our society evolve, and hopefully as sex-role stereotypes diminish further. An additional suggestion, then, is that future study be undertaken to determine if the findings reported herein are applicable to different age groups and people of varying backgrounds and subcultures.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974).

[2]Janet S. Chafetz, Masculine/Feminine or Human? (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1974).

[3]John E. Baird, Jr., "Sex-Differences in Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62, (1976), 179-192.

[4]Nena O'Neill and George O'Neill, Open Marriage (New York: Evans and Company, 1972).

[5]William H. Masters and Virginia E. Johnson, The Pleasure Bond (Boston-Toronto: Little Brown, 1974).

[6]Bobby R. Patton and Bonnie R. Ritter, Living Together. . .Female/Male Communication (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976).

[7]O'Neill and O'Neill, pp. 221-235.

[8]David W. Johnson, Reaching Out: Interpersonal Effectiveness and Self-Actualization (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), 43.

[9]Jack R. Gibb, "Climate for Trust Formation," T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method, ed. Leland P. Bradford, Jack R. Gibb, and Kenneth D. Benne (New York: Wiley, 1964), 279-309; Jack R. Gibb, and Lorraine M. Gibb, "Humanistic Elements in Group Growth," Challenges in Humanistic Psychology, ed. James Bugental (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967), 161-170.

[10]Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961).

[11]Kim Giffin and Richard E. Barnes, Trusting Me, Trusting You (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976), 9.

[12]Sidney M. Jourard, The Transparent Self, rev. ed. (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1971), 5, 232.

[13]Ibid., p. 231.

[14]Diane L. Lockwood and Virginia A. Eman, "Exploratory Research Toward a Theory of Information Exchange Within the Friendship Context," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, California, December, 1976.

[15]Kim Giffin, Mary Heider, Barbara Groginsky and Barbara Drake, A Study of the Relationship Among Four Variables: Speech Anxiety, Self-Concept, Social Alienation, and Trust of Others, Communication Research Center Report #24 (Lawrence, Kansas, 1970).

[16]Kim Giffin, "Interaction Variables of Interpersonal Trust," Humanitias, 9, (1973), 297-315.

[17]Maccoby and Jacklin, pp. 150-163.

[18]Inge K. Broverman et al., "Sex-Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal," Journal of Social Issues, 28, (1972), 59-78.

[19]Julian B. Rotter, "A New Scale for the Measurement of Interpersonal Trust," Journal of Personality, 35, (1967), 651-665; Lawrence S. Wrightsman, Jr., Assumptions About Human Nature: A Social-Psychological Approach (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1974), 73, 80-83, 161-171; Kim Giffin, "The Contribution of Studies of Source Credibility To A Theory of Interpersonal Trust in the Communication Process," Psychological Bulletin, 68, (1967), 104-120.

[20]Giffin, 1967, 105.

[21]Kim Giffin, The Trust Differential, Communication Research Center Report #18 (Lawrence, Kansas, 1968a).

[22]Giffin and Barnes, 46.

[23]Given that the study was exploratory in nature there was no basis for predicting the direction of expected differences.

[24]See Kim Giffin, An Experimental Evaluation of the Trust Differential, Communication Research Center Report #19, (Lawrence, Kansas, 1968b), where evidence is reported for independence and stability of factor structure.

[25]Wrightsman, 80-83.

[26]There is a relationship between attitudes and behaviors but, contrary to the popular notion, this relationship is almost always indirect. Therefore, further research must match the level at which attitudes and dependent variables are conceptualized and measured (See Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen, Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior, /Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975/, 335-368.).

APPENDIX

Table 1

Design

Sex of Attitude Object	Male		Female	
Relationship to Attitude Object	Closest	General	Closest	General
Sex of Subject Male	n = 25	n = 25	n = 26	n = 26
Sex of Subject Female	n = 34	n = 33	n = 35	n = 33

N = 237

Table 2

ANOVA: Expertness Dimension of GTD

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
[1]SEX	258.73462	1	258.73462	5.96326*
SEXAO	67.873728	1	67.873728	1.56350
RELAO	1701.05823	1	1701.05823	39.20562**
SEX X SEXAO	550.89917	1	550.89917	12.69700**
SEX X RELAO	1.74268	1	1.74268	0.04016
SEXAO X RELAO	27.27319	1	27.27319	0.62859
SEX X SEXAO X RELAO	194.62769	1	194.62769	4.48574*
Error	9935.88037	229	43.38812	

[1]SEX = Sex of Subject; SEXAO = Sex of Attitude Object; RELAO = Relationship to Attitude Object (closest or general)

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.001$

Table 3

ANOVA: Character Dimension of GTD

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
[1]SEX	176.96643	1	176.96643	2.95131
SEXAO	897.34828	1	897.34828	14.96529*
RELAO	4322.06433	1	4322.06433	72.08009*
SEX X SEXAO	51.24329	1	51.24329	0.85460
SEX X RELAO	154.15100	1	154.15100	2.57081
SEXAO X RELAO	139.78955	1	139.78955	2.33130
SEX X SEXAO X RELAO	161.80225	1	161.80225	2.69841
Error	13731.29114	229	59.96197	

[1]SEX = Sex of Subject; SEXAO = Sex of Attitude Object; RELAO = Relationship to Attitude Object (closest or general).

*$p < 0.001$

Table 4

ANOVA: Dynamism Dimension of GTD

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
[1]SEX	230.68286	1	230.68286	4.55417*
SEXAO	1143.53357	1	1143.53357	22.57579**
RELAO	1112.79004	1	1112.79004	21.96885**
SEX X SEXAO	64.90112	1	64.90112	1.28129
SEX X RELAO	1.62756	1	1.62756	0.03213
SEXAO X RELAO	610.65808	1	610.65808	12.05569**
SEX X SEXAO X RELAO	63.69482	1	63.69482	1.25747
Error	11599.55811	229	50.65309	

[1]SEX = Sex of Subject; SEXAO = Sex of Attitude Object; RELAO = Relationship to Attitude Object ("close" or "general")

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.001$

Table 5

Combined Means: Sex of Attitude Object
and Relationship to Attitude Object

	Relationship to Attitude Object		
Sex of Attitude Object	"Closest Friend"	"In General"	F
"Males"	94.79	92.52	1.48
"Females"	92.40	77.16	66.58*

*p < 0.001